

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Holy Names University

Professional Services Division

February 13, 2008

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at Holy Names University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions For all Programs offered by the Institution

Common Standards (1998)

	Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Standard 1: Education Leadership	X		
Standard 2: Resources	X		
Standard 3: Faculty	X		
Standard 4: Evaluation			X
Standard 5: Admission	X		
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	X		
Standard 7: School Collaboration	X		
Standard 8: District Field Supervisors		X	

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject	19	17	2	0
Single Subject	19	16	2	1
Education Specialist: MM Level I	17	13	3	1
Education Specialist: MM Level II	12	9	3	0

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report**

Institution: Holy Names University

Dates of Visit: February 10-13, 2008

Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation for Holy Names University was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards -

The total team reviewed each element of the eight Common Standards and decided as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met concerns. **Standard 4: Evaluation** is 'Not Met' and **Standard 8: Field Supervisors** is 'Met with Concerns.' All other Common Standards are Met.

Program Standards –

Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for each of the programs. Following these discussions of each program reviewed, the total team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns or not met. In the Multiple Subject Program, seventeen standards are 'Met,' with two standards 'Met with Concerns'. In the Single Subject Program, sixteen standards are 'Met,' two standards 'Met with Concerns,' and one standard 'Not Met.' The Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Level I Program has eight standards 'Met,' three standards with 'Met with Concerns,' and one standard 'Not Met.' The Level II program has nine standards 'Met' and three standards 'Met with Concerns.'

Overall Recommendation –

Due to the one Common Standard that is 'Not Met,' the one Common Standard 'Met with Concerns,' and the program standards 'Met with Concerns' or 'Not Met,' the team reached consensus on the accreditation recommendation of **Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations** for Holy Names University and all of its credential programs.

Following are the recommended stipulations:

1. That the unit provide evidence that all program and Common Standards less than fully met are now met.
2. That the unit provide evidence of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and other stakeholders. The system must provide evidence of how the data is analyzed and used for program improvement.
3. That a focused revisit take place in one year, focusing on a) assessment of candidate competence in the single subject and education specialist credential programs and b) the two stipulations above.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Education Specialist (Special Education)
 - Preliminary Level I
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Internship
 - Professional Level II
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
- Multiple Subject
 - Multiple Subject
 - Multiple Subject Internship
- Single Subject
 - Single Subject
 - Single Subject Internship

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Holy Names University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Holy Names University continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Leader:	Mark Cary Davis Joint Unified School District, Retired
Common Standards Cluster:	Jody Daughtry CSU Fresno
Basic Credential Programs Cluster:	Dan Elliott , Cluster Leader Azusa Pacific University Pat Sheehan Orange County Office of Education Carol Brock National University
Staff to the Accreditation Team	Teri Clark , Administrator Rebecca Parker , Consultant

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog	Candidate Portfolios
Institutional Self Study	Candidate Work Samples
Course Syllabi	Schedule of Classes
Candidate Files	Advisement Documents
Fieldwork Handbook	Faculty Vitae
Follow-up Survey Results	Faculty Handbook
Course Syllabi	Library Holdings
Information Booklet	Program Evaluation Data
Field Experience Notebook	Website

Interviews Conducted

	Common Standards Cluster	Program Cluster	Totals
Program Faculty	10	15	25
Institutional Administration	12	5	17
Candidates	23	21	44
Graduates	3	25	28
Employers of Graduates	2	10	12
Supervising Practitioners/Master Teachers	2	8	10
Advisors	2	7	9
School Administrators	1	10	11
Credential Analyst	2	1	3
Advisory Committee	0	0	0
Field Supervisors	0	3	3
University Management	4	0	4
Total			166

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

Holy Names University is a small liberal arts University in the Oakland hills. Once a College for Women only, it has developed into a coeducation institution with a strong graduate student body. Founded in 1868, it has always considered professional education one of its primary responsibilities. The University historically has connected itself in word and action with the education of teachers even before it was approved by the California Board of Education in 1930. The Education Department has continued this tradition in professional education without interruption. 2007 marked the University's 140th year "on the hill", its current location in the hills of Oakland, California.

Department of Education

Holy Names University Department of Education has put forth a unique program of preparing and equipping teachers who are multi-culturally sensitive and equipped to meet the very special needs of learners in urban environments. Elements of social justice and meeting the needs of English learners, the disabled and the disadvantaged are threaded throughout the courses and field experiences that make up the credential preparation programs. The 'ethos' of the university stems from its heritage of self-sacrificing Catholic nuns who were ready to do whatever it took to meet the needs of and care for others. The design of the Holy Names teacher preparation program is very much in that ethos. The program attracts candidates who seek engagement in that particular educational worldview.

As indicated by program goals and objectives, several principles provide the rationale for the Holy Names teacher education program. First, the program is guided by a commitment to intellectual excellence which will result in teachers who seek creative solutions to educational problems and who understand the theoretical underpinnings of effective classroom practices. Second, the program focuses on the development of effective teachers for urban schools. Third, concern for equity leads the program to seek to include teacher candidates who are representative of diverse ethnic, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds. Fourth, a concern for personal attention and close interaction with teacher candidates results in relatively small programs of teacher preparation."

Holy Names operates three different types of educator preparation programs: Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate-Level I and Level II.

Table 1: Programs Offered by Holy Names University

	Program Level	Current Students	Program Completers 06-07	Expected Completers 07-08	Agency Reviewing the Program
Multiple Subject	Initial	41	8	13	CTC
Single Subject	Initial	55	11	10	CTC
Education Specialist-Level I	Initial	32	11	8	CTC
Education Specialist-Level II	Advanced	6			CTC

The visit

The visit to Holy Names University began on Sunday, February 10 at noon. The team members met at the hotel and were transported to the campus. A team meeting, document review and orientation to the programs offered by the institution took place on Sunday afternoon. In addition, team members began interviewing stakeholders. Data collection continued on Monday and through Tuesday including school site visits. Team members visited three truly unique, effective schools where candidates are employed as interns. These specialized schools were filled with extremely creative teachers and led by innovative instructional leaders. On Tuesday morning, the team lead presented the Mid-Visit Report to the chair of the department. On Tuesday evening the team met to discuss all standards and programs. Consensus was reached on all standard findings and an accreditation recommendation. The Exit Report was held on the campus at 1 p.m. on Wednesday, February 13, 2008.

CTC Common Standards

Standard 1: Education Leadership

Standard Met

The institution (faculty, dean/director and institutional administration) articulates and supports a vision for the preparation of professional educators. All professional preparation programs are organized, governed, and coordinated with the active involvement of credential program faculty. Institutional leadership fosters cohesiveness in management; delegates responsibility and authority appropriately; resolves each professional preparation program's administrative needs as promptly as feasible; and represents the interests of each program in the institution, the education profession, and the school community.

Credential programs at Holy Names (HNU) University are based on a clearly-articulated vision of professional educators who are intellectually rigorous, dedicated to serving diverse student populations in urban settings, and who display a high level of commitment to supporting all students in being successful. This vision is aligned with the historic tradition of action-oriented service central to the mission of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, who founded the University in 1868.

HNU credential programs have grown and evolved over decades in collaboration with public schools in the Oakland-Alameda area. Programs are organized, governed, and coordinated with active involvement of credential program faculty. The small number of program faculty allows for continual communication and collaboration among faculty in addressing ongoing program issues, as well as in planning and implementing program changes.

The chair of the Education Department is responsible for the administration of all credential programs as well as several other programs offered by the department. The chair reports to, and receives direction from the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Evidence from interviews with faculty and department staff as well as from documents indicate that responsibilities are appropriately delegated and that each professional program's administrative needs are resolved as promptly as feasible.

The participation of program faculty on key university committees, including the Graduate Curriculum and Standards Council, the Graduate Administrative Council, and the Teacher Education Committee, ensures that the interests of credential programs are well represented at the university level. In addition, faculty members participate actively in professional organizations and community advisory groups.

Area for Growth in Standard Implementation

The institution might consider formalizing expectations, structures, and/or procedures to support equitable and prompt resolution of administrative needs across all credential programs.

Standard 2: Resources

Standard Met

Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for the effective operation of credential preparation program, to enable it to be effective in coordination, advising, curriculum, instruction, and field experiences. Library and media computer facilities, and support personnel, among others, are adequate.

Evidence from documents and from interviews with program and institutional leadership indicate that credential preparation programs are allocated adequate resources for their effective operation. Financial data from the institution indicate that the Education Department receives resources commensurate to program enrollment and resources available for all university programs. Office space is provided for full time faculty and for two part-time faculty as well as for the credential analyst and administrative assistant. In addition, the department has set aside a room for a curriculum library including instructional materials and assessment instruments. Laptop computers and digital projectors are available for checkout.

Education Department resource requests are submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Decisions on resource allocation are made collaboratively by HNU vice presidents (including the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Vice President for Finance and Administration) after discussion and review of institutional resource needs.

The Education Department budget includes funding for a part-time Administrative Assistant to support program faculty and administration and a full time Credential Analyst to assist students throughout the program in completing credential requirements.

An interview with the Director of IT Services indicated that this department mainly provides service for business and administrative functions; and an interview with the Director of Library Services provided evidence that adequate materials and support are available for credential program candidates.

Area for Growth in Standard Implementation

Since weekend and evening classes play a significant role in HNU credential programs, candidates reported reference librarian support beyond the current-scheduled daytime hours would be helpful. The same is true of IT support for faculty and students working during evenings and weekends, during hours in which the IT Department is not currently staffed.

Standard 3: Faculty

Standard Met

Qualified persons are hired and assigned to teach all courses and supervise all field experiences in each credential preparation program. Faculty reflect and are knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity. The institution provides support for faculty development, and recognizes and rewards outstanding teaching. The institution regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, and retains in credential programs only those individuals who are consistently effective.

The Education Department has four full-time faculty members and over 30 part-time faculty members. Some faculty members have doctorates and all others have master's degrees. Many hold or have held relevant professional positions in the P-12 system such as district administrators, school level administrators, and teachers. In addition, they are a professionally active faculty in terms of publishing, presenting at professional conferences, and conducting professional development activities.

The faculty is ethnically diverse. The ethnic representation of full-time faculty and adjunct instructors for the Education Department is as follows:

African-American:	13
Caucasian:	13
Latino:	3

Faculty members' diversity, wide-ranging professional roles in urban school districts, publications, and presentations suggest that they are knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity. Interviews with candidates and graduates provided clear corroboration that program faculty demonstrate a high level of expertise in all areas.

Professional development opportunities recently made available to faculty include training in the Performance Assessment for California Teachers, a local conference on information literacy, funded travel to the California Council on Teacher Education, monthly presentations for the education community sponsored by the RASKOB Center, presentations on pedagogy for university faculty offered through the Irvine Faculty Development Grant, and opportunities to discuss complex topics related to mild and moderate disabilities as part of the In-Depth series, and sabbatical leaves.

The institution recognizes effective teaching through the awarding of tenure and advancement in academic rank. Outstanding teaching is recognized through the Faculty Alumni Award, which honors outstanding teaching and service, and the Above and Beyond Award, which honors faculty and staff who exceed expectations for their position.

In terms of identifying effective and ineffective course instructors and field supervisors, every course and every field experience is evaluated every semester. Instructor and supervisor evaluations are reviewed by the department chair and there is a process to remove ineffective instructors or supervisors.

Strength in Standard Implementation

Faculty members' current professional experience with P-12 education is rich and varied. Candidates consistently report that faculty is always available for advice and assistance.

Standard 4: Evaluation

Standard Not Met

The institution regularly involves program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses and field experiences, which leads to substantive improvements in each credential preparation program, as needed. Meaningful opportunities are provided for professional practitioners and diverse community members to become involved in program design, development and evaluation activities.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, district field supervisors and employers provided numerous instances in which feedback from these groups has resulted in program improvements. The high level of collaboration and frequent interaction between members of these constituencies and program faculty at HNU has allowed many of these changes to be implemented through informal means. During the decades in which credential programs have been offered at HNU, many members of the wider university community have been involved in program design and development.

At the same time, there is no formalized process for regularly involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses, field experiences, and measures of candidate competency, that leads to substantive improvement in each credential program. Evidence indicates that student evaluation of course work and instructors is the only program evaluation data currently being consistently collected, but the team found only a few instances in which this data prompted program improvements.

Standard 5: Admission

Standard Met

In each professional preparation program, candidates are admitted on the basis of well defined admission criteria and procedures (including all Commission-adopted admission requirements) that utilize multiple measures. The admission of students from a diverse population is encouraged. The institution determines that candidates meet high academic standards, as evidenced by appropriate measures of academic achievement, and demonstrate strong potential for professional success in schools, as evidenced by appropriate measures of personal characteristics and prior experience.

Candidates in all credential programs at HNU are admitted on the basis of clearly-identified criteria, including undergraduate degree and GPA. In addition, the admissions process requires that students submit letters of recommendation and be interviewed by one or more program faculty. HNU's mission to serve diverse student populations in urban settings is clearly articulated to prospective candidates and those applying to the program represent the diversity of the populations they would be serving as teachers. Average GPA for candidates admitted to credential programs is equivalent to that of students admitted to other graduate programs at HNU.

Actual admission decisions are made by the Teacher Education Committee (comprised of members of the education department and six members from across university disciplines), and a key consideration in the admissions process is the evidence from records and interviews indicating that the candidate demonstrates strong potential for success in working with diverse student populations.

All credential programs allow for provisional admission of students who may lack some pre-requisite coursework or who have not yet passed CBEST or CSET. To be admitted provisionally, candidates must show evidence of strength in prior experience and preparation, and the ability to complete prerequisite coursework or successfully pass state-mandated tests. Provisionally admitted students are carefully monitored until they complete all requirements for full admission.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Standard Met

Qualified members of the institution's staff are assigned and available to advise candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, as the need arises, and to assist in their professional placement. Adequate information is readily available to guide each candidate's attainment of all program and credential requirements. The institution assists candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, program faculty, and university supervisors provided clear evidence that candidates are well-advised. Advisors are knowledgeable about coursework and credential requirements, and candidates' questions and concerns are addressed in a timely and responsive manner. Candidates cited numerous examples of situations in which program faculty and supervisors responded quickly and effectively to answer questions and resolve problems.

Program staff members keep candidates apprised of program requirements, filing dates, and other information as they move through the program. Interviews indicated candidates, interns, and graduates felt uniformly well informed and well served by program faculty and staff. Necessary forms and university bulletins related to program requirements are available in the credential program office.

When problems arise or students need special assistance, candidates and graduates reported that they received individual support for as long as needed to solve the problem or assist the person in meeting program requirements. Program records and interviews with program faculty validate that students who are not suited for entry or advancement in the education profession are not allowed to complete the program.

Strength in Standard Implementation

Candidates and graduates praised program faculty for their commitment and support. Team members heard countless examples of instances in which faculty and supervisors "went the extra mile" or "never gave up" in helping those going through credential programs.

Program faculty members were reported to be highly accessible in all credential programs. Interviews revealed examples of candidates having email exchanges with faculty at 2 a.m.; master teachers reported being able to "pick up the phone anytime" they had a question or concern and getting rapid responses in all cases.

Standard 7: School Collaboration

Standard Met

For each credential preparation program, the institution collaborates with local school personnel in selecting suitable school sites and effective clinical personnel for guiding candidates through a planned sequence of fieldwork/clinical experiences that is based on a well developed rationale.

With respect to the Multiple Subject Credential program, effective collaboration of the HNU Education Department and school site personnel is evidenced by the fact that most candidates reported satisfaction in working with the school sites and supervisors during their fieldwork. Documents stated that the program coordinator and field supervisor use formal criteria as well as informal networking to select suitable school sites as well as accomplished master teachers. The program coordinator and the field supervisor work with school principals in this process.

On the other hand, interns reported varying levels of satisfaction with site supervisors in the Single Subject and Education Specialist Programs. Often, when the site supervisor was immediately and routinely available, support was more likely to be viewed as satisfactory.

Area for Growth in Standard Implementation

Strengthen the procedures for determining the qualifications and training for effective clinical personnel, especially for Single Subject interns.

Standard 8: Field Supervisors

Standard Met with Concerns

Each district-employed field experience supervisor is carefully selected, trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, and certified and experienced in either teaching the subject(s) of the class or performing the services authorized by the credential. District supervisors and supervisory activities are appropriately evaluated, recognized and rewarded by the institution.

In the Multiple Subject Credential Program, master teachers are carefully selected on the basis of meeting formal criteria, recommendations from the field, and personal knowledge of the program coordinator and university supervisor. Orientation and training regarding the supervisory role is informal, but master teachers who were interviewed reported that it is satisfactory. Evaluation of master teachers is informal. Master teachers in this program are appropriately certified and experienced. In addition to the intrinsic reward of contributing to the development of a prospective new teacher, master teachers receive a unit of university credit.

In the Education Specialist and the Single Subject Credential Programs, there is little or no evidence that training or orientation has been provided to site supervisors or mentors regarding their specific roles. There is no evidence that site supervisors or mentors for these two programs are evaluated by HNU.

Multiple Subject Credential Multiple Subject Internship Credential

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, the program document, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met except for the following:

Standard 8A(f) Health

Met with Concerns

Standard 8A(f) requires that MS candidates “learn content-specific teaching strategies that are effective in achieving the goals of the acceptance of personal responsibility for lifelong health; respect for and promotion of the health of others; understanding of the process of growth and development; and informed use of health-related information, products, and services.” There is a lack of evidence that candidates have the opportunity to learn the required content.

Standard 10: Preparation for Learning to Create a Supportive, Healthy Environment for Student Learning

Met with Concerns

The course syllabus EDUC X393A; *Health Education for Teachers* (1) unit, identifies some objectives related to this standard. However, much of the content, learning activities, and assessments required by the standard are not evident. There is a lack of evidence that candidates have the opportunity to learn the content required in 10(c) i, ii, iii, iv, 10(d), and 10(e).

Strengths in Program Implementation

- Support for candidates, offered by HNU, is appreciated and praised greatly by candidates, graduates, instructors, supervising teachers and site administrators.
- Urban emphasis and multicultural awareness is valued and developed or enhanced in candidates.
- The program is determined to serve urban school needs in general and the Oakland urban schools in particular.

Single Subject Credential Program

Single Subject Credential and Single Subject Internship Program

Findings on Standards

After thorough review of the institutional report, a careful analysis of all supporting documentation, interviews of university and program administrators, Single Subject program faculty and support staff, current candidates, graduates, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that most of the program standards are met with the exception of the following:

Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors **Not Met**

The following elements of Standard 16 were not verified through interviews or documents provided by HNU:

Process for selecting mentor teachers: Interviews with principals, candidates, and graduates indicated inconsistent application of the criteria for selecting mentor teachers. One site administrator reported no coordination with a HNU supervisor when selecting the mentors for three interns.

Properly credentialed mentor teachers: The team found no documentation that the program verifies that all site level mentors hold the appropriate California credentials.

Planned training for mentors: No data were provided to demonstrate how many, if any, mentor teachers participated in formal or informal HNU training.

Support from identified mentor: Some candidates reported little involvement or support from their identified mentors.

Standard 18: Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments during the Program **Met with Concerns**

Interviews with candidates, employers, and supervisors indicated that candidates are perceived as effective and well prepared—as defined by Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Faculty members interviewed said that completion of their courses with grades of an A or B provided evidence of assessment for introductory understanding of teaching skills represented in the TPEs. However, two university supervisors interviewed did not express working knowledge of the TPEs.

Standard 19: Assessment of Candidate Performance **Met with Concerns**

The team found inconsistent evidence (beyond grades of A or B in program courses) that candidates are both formatively and summatively assessed throughout the program.

- Some candidate files contained end-of-teaching assessments on TPEs while others did not.
- Some candidates interviewed reported their supervisor had assessed them; others reported that the supervisor had not.
- Some supervisors interviewed were unaware that they were supposed to make the final evaluation for candidates they supervised. Documents in some student's files indicated a TPE-based final assessment. Yet, in others no final assessments were found even though a credential had been recommended.

Strengths in Program Implementation

- Urban emphasis and multicultural awareness is valued and developed or enhanced in candidates.
- The program is determined to serve urban school needs in general and the Oakland urban schools in particular.

Education Specialist Credential Programs:
Mild/Moderate: Level I
Mild/Moderate: Internship Credential

Findings on Standards:

After review of the program, supporting documentation and completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, program faculty, employers of graduates, school administrators and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards for the Mild/Moderate Level 1 and Mild/Moderate Internship credential are met, except for the following:

Standard 14 – Qualifications Responsibilities of Supervisors and Selection of Field Sites **Met with Concerns**

There is limited evidence that university supervisors and no evidence that field supervisors evaluate candidates' performance in relationship to each standard.

Standard 15 – Managing Learning Environments **Met with Concerns**

There is a lack of evidence that candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge and skill in facilitating self-advocacy.

Standard 17 – Assessment, Curriculum and Instruction **Met with Concerns**

After examining syllabi and interviewing students, there is a lack of evidence that candidates are required to demonstrate strategies for recommending services, and/or including instruction that includes the use of supplementary aids, services and technology.

Standard 18 – Determination of Candidate Competence **Not Met**

Although there is ongoing assessment in courses, there is no 'thorough documentation' of the assessment of candidate competence. There is no evidence of field supervisors evaluating the candidate competence. The program document states and graduates report that assistance is given to candidates who require additional instruction to be successful, but the team was unable to find written evidence of this assistance. Based on student records and interviews, the requirement for Level II is not addressed with Level I candidates.

Strengths in Program Implementation

- Candidates and graduates report that the faculty is a significant strength of the program especially in their availability and support.
- Support for candidates, offered by HNU, is appreciated and praised greatly by candidates, graduates, instructors, supervising teachers and site administrators.
- Urban emphasis and multicultural awareness is valued and developed or enhanced in candidates.
- The program is determined to serve urban school needs in general and the Oakland urban schools in particular.

Areas for Growth in Program Implementation:

Candidate lesson plans should include references to assessment criteria as well as the academic content standards.

Education Specialist Credential Programs: Mild/Moderate Level II

Findings on Standards:

After review of the program, supporting documentation and completion of interviews with graduates, the team determined that all program standards for the Mild/Moderate Level II credential are met, except for the following:

Standard 12 – Assessment of Candidate Competence

Met with Concerns

Student records do not document an authentic and fair assessment process to verify that candidates have met Level II requirements.

Standard 14 – Advanced Behavioral, Emotional, Environmental Supports

Met with Concerns

Based on evidence reviewed by the team, candidates are not required to collaborate with educational, mental health, and other community resources in any ongoing processes.

Standard 16 – Transition and Transition Planning

Met with Concerns

Although the area of transition is addressed in class, there is no evidence that candidates are required to collaborate with personnel from other educational and community agencies to plan for successful transitions by students.

Strengths in Program Implementation

Graduates report that faculty is a significant strength of the program. They were particularly enthusiastic about Education 366: *Advanced Assessment and Instruction*, citing that as one of the best courses in the program.

Areas for Growth in Program Implementation

Several candidates and site administrators stated they would like candidates to be more familiar with the IEP process, resources and support agencies, as well as the issues and considerations around Response to Intervention.